In Support of Schaeffer Cox #19 August 24, 2017.

Schaeffer established the Peacemakers Militia in Fairbanks Alaska. It was at the same time I help create the Alaska Citizens Militia throughout Alaska.

We both understood the threat to our respective communities on the ever expanding government overreach on our Rights codified in the first Ten Amendments to our Constitution. That along with the economic meltdown that many believed would end our government’s hegemonic control of the world economy.

Schaeffer was homeschooled. He understood the history of our Bill of Rights at an early age. I was in my 40’s before I had full understanding.

The general (public educated) population does not have an understanding of our Bill of Rights.

My clarity came as I read a book titled “The Life and Character of Patrick Henry.” Attached are pages 197 and 198 from my 1841 edition of the original 1815 publication. Words spoken by Patrick Henry after the Revolutionary War and during the debates concerning creating a new (current) Constitutional form of republican government.

Also attached are Patrick Henry’s spoken words-

“My greatest objection to this government [Constitutional Republic] is, that is does not leave us a means of defending our rights, or of waging war against tyrants.”

Many of the founders feared a strong central government. They understood that every government in history devolves into complete despotism. They codified the individual and collective right of gun ownership. The media today print story after story how any individual who fears our government must be delusional. No need for the Second Amendment. Perhaps there's no need for any of our God given Rights codified in our Bill of Rights.

Were our Founders Delusional? Or in the words of Defense attorney Filipovic (in regards to Cox) individuals with “paranoid fantasy.” Why would anyone fear such a benevolent Constitutional Government? Yet our founders had such a fear based on history.

Filipovic along with DOJ prosecutor Skrocki do not understand the intent of our Second Amendment or Schaeffer Cox’s behavior.

The Second Amendment has nothing to do with hunting or protecting your home from a thief. It was codified to protect us from those who would or have ravaged our individual rights.

The Heller case (District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570) case gave great exhilaration to gun right advocates. Believing the individual ownership was the focus of the Second Amendment.
It was not the only issue. The second part was the collective right of creating a militia. Community members armed to protect the safety of individuals and community against tyranny. Armed with the “imposition of proper discipline and training,” according to Jurist Antonin Scalia.

And so our God given Right for self defense was codified in the Second Amendment. A right preexisting in this newly created republican government (Constitution in 1789 and Bill of Rights 1791)

Groups of people have exercised their self defense against tyranny. The Red Neck Wars, The Matewan Massacre, the labor movement, Bonus Army of 1932, The battle of Athens and The Civil Rights movement to mention a few.

With our federal government’s behavior once again the militia movement has been resurrected. Exercising our collective right to form and participate in a militia.

Can a militia be under the control of any individual as Skrocki stated in oral arguments?

Not hardly. More on that next time.

Ray Southwell

Nikiski Alaska
In reply to this, Mr. Henry said:—"The honourable gentleman who presides told us, that, to prevent abuses in our government, we will assemble in convention, recall our delegated powers, and punish our tyrants for abusing the trust reposed in them. Oh, sir, we should be fine times, indeed, if to punish tyrants, it were only necessary to assemble the people! Your arms wherewith you could defend yourselves, are gone! and you have no longer an aristocratical, no longer a democratical spirit. Did you ever read of any revolution in any nation, brought about by the punishment of those in power, inflicted by those who had no power at all? You read of a riot act in a country which is called one of the freest in the world, where a few neighbours cannot assemble, without the risk of being shot by a hired soldiery, the engines of despotism.

"We may see such an act in America. A standing army will have to execute the execrable commands of tyrants; but how are you to punish them? Will you order them to be punished? Who shall obey these orders? Will your mace-bearer be a match for a disciplined regiment? In what situation are we to be? The clause before you gives a power of direct taxation, unbounded and unlimited; exclusive power of legislation, in all cases whatsoever, for ten miles square; and over all places purchased for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, &c. What resistance could be made? The attempt would be madness. You will find all the strength of this country in the hands of your enemies; those garrisons will naturally be the strongest places in the country. Your militia is given up to congress, also, in another part of this plan; they will therefore act as they think proper; all power will be in their own possession; you cannot force them to receive their punishment."

Perhaps said long enough to become a stale and old-fashioned view, but I can't help thinking that such views are not altogether without effect. We are told in these times of the necessity of strong government; but I think it is unfortunate that the word is so often coupled with the word, 'strong.' What is the use of having a strong government, if it is not used for the right purposes? It is not the size of the army or the number of the soldiers that is the matter, but the wisdom and discretion of their commanders.